

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.       | FII        | LING DATE  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/732,803            | 12/11/2003 |            | Sadayuki Kobayashi   | IPE-030             | 5888             |
| 20374                 | 7590       | 01/13/2006 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| KUBOVCII<br>SUITE 710 | C & KUB    | OVCIK      | ROBERTSON, JEFFREY   |                     |                  |
| 900 17TH ST           | REET NV    | V          | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
| WASHINGT              | ON, DC     | 20006      | 1712                 |                     |                  |

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/732,803   | KOBAYASHI ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jeffrey B. Robertson   | 1712  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app   | -  | orrespondence address   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Period for Reply   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim (ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | l.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 De  | ecember 2003.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This   | action is non-final.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowan  | ) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45   | 3 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)☐ Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.   | 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> are subject to restriction and/or e  | election requirement.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine   | r.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce  | epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the E   | Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the o  | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See  | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti  |  | ` ,   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | aminer. Note the attached Office   | Action or form PTO-152.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents  |  | on No   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior  | • •  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau  | (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | •   |  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of  | of the certified copies not receive  | d.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 4) ∐ Interview Summary<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Da  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   | 5) Notice of Informal P  | atent Application (PTO-152)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | 6)  Other:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-8 and 16-21, drawn to polymer alloys, classified in class 525, subclass 439.
  - II. Claims 9-12, drawn to a film or sheet, classified in class 428, subclass332.
  - III. Claims 13-15, drawn to a molded article, classified in class 428, subclass 480.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as molded articles and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Application/Control Number: 10/732,803

Art Unit: 1712

anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Page 3

- 3. Inventions I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a film or sheet and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 4. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions Groups II and III have different functions in that Group II is either a film or sheet and Group III is a molded article.
- 5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

## **Election of Species**

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: election of the chemical identity of the at least two resins is required as follows.

- a. Identity of the first polymer resin, if thermoplastic polyester is selected, election among polyethylene terephthalate and polybutylene terephthalate is required.
- b. Identity of the second polymer resin, for example between polycarbonate and polyphenylene sulfide.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 13, and 14 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1712

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey B. Robertson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1092. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/732,803

Art Unit: 1712

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey B. Robertsor Primary Examiner

Page 6

Art Unit 1712

**JBR**